



JUL 20 2005

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Attn: Document Control Desk
Washington, D.C. 20555

L-2005-145
10 CFR 50.54(f)

Re: Florida Power and Light Company
St. Lucie Units 1 and 2
Docket Nos. 50-335 and 50-389
Turkey Point Units 3 and 4
Docket Nos. 50-250 and 50-251

FPL Energy – Seabrook, LLC
Seabrook Station
Docket No. 50-443

NRC Generic Letter 2004-02
Request for Additional Information
Potential Impact of Debris Blockage on Emergency Recirculation
During Design Basis Accidents at Pressurized Water Reactors

By letter L-2005-034 dated March 4, 2005, Florida Power and Light Company (FPL), the licensee for the St. Lucie Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, and the Turkey Point Nuclear Plant, Units 3 and 4, and FPL Energy Seabrook, LLC (FPL Energy Seabrook), the licensee for Seabrook Station, submitted the 90-day response requested by Generic Letter 2004-02.

By individual letters dated June 2, 2005, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff issued identical requests for additional information (RAI) to the St. Lucie Plant, Units 1 and 2, and the Turkey Point Plant, Units 3 and 4, to support their review of the FPL 90-day response to Generic Letter 2004-02. By letter dated June 3, 2005, the NRC staff issued an identical request for additional information (RAI) to FPL Energy Seabrook Station to support their review of the Seabrook Station 90-day response to Generic Letter 2004-02.

The response to the requests for additional information is attached.

The attached information is provided pursuant to the requirements of Section 182a of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended and 10 CFR 50.54(f).

If you should have any questions, please contact Mr. Rajiv S. Kundalkar at (561) 694-4848.

A116

St. Lucie Units 1 and 2, Docket No. 50-335 and 50-389
Turkey Point Units 3 and 4, Docket No. 50-250 and 50-251
Seabrook Station, Docket No. 50-443
L-2005-145, Page 2 of 2

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.
Executed on July 22, 2005

Sincerely yours,



J. A. Stall
Senior Vice President, Nuclear and
Chief Nuclear Officer

Attachment

cc: Regional Administrator, Region I
Regional Administrator, Region II
USNRC Project Manager, St Lucie and Turkey Point
Senior Resident Inspector, USNRC, St. Lucie
Senior Resident Inspector, USNRC, Turkey Point
USNRC Project Manager, Seabrook Station
Senior Resident Inspector, USNRC, Seabrook Station

ATTACHMENT

RESPONSE FOR ST. LUCIE UNITS 1 AND 2 , TURKEY POINT UNITS 3 AND 4 AND SEABROOK STATION

On June 2, 2005 the NRC issued a Request for Additional Information (RAI) related to Generic Letter 2004-02, "Potential Impact of Debris Blockage on Emergency Sump Recirculation at Pressurized-Water Reactors (TAC Nos. MC4710 and MC4711 for FPL's St. Lucie Plant Units 1 and 2, and TAC Nos. MC4725 and MC4726 for FPL's Turkey Point Plant Units 3 and 4). On June 3, 2005, the NRC issued the same request for FPL Energy's Seabrook Station (TAC No. MC4716). The RAI's are identical and request a discussion of the overall plans and schedule for evaluating chemical effects and plans for performing testing to support the evaluation of chemical effects.

NRC REQUESTED INFORMATION

NRC Transmittal Letter

This RAI requests additional information about your overall plans and schedules and not any information on detailed plans or extensive analysis.

NRC RAI

For addressing chemical effects, you state the evaluation may occur after the September 1, 2005, response due date, depending on the schedule for testing and the availability of industry guidance. This is contrary to the information request in GL 2004-02, which requests that chemical effects be addressed in the September 1, 2005 response. This delay is also contrary to the staff's position that there are sufficient bases to address sump vulnerability to chemical effects and that the September response will be incomplete if the evaluation is incomplete, the design is not complete, or there is no schedule for upgrades. In this light, please discuss your plans and schedule for evaluating chemical effects. In addition, please discuss any plans for performing testing to support your evaluation of this effect.

RESPONSE TO NRC REQUESTED INFORMATION

As requested, information is being provided that describes the FPL and FPL Energy Seabrook overall plan and schedule for evaluating chemical effects.

The FPL and FPL Energy Seabrook overall plan for chemical effects is to reserve margin to accommodate chemical effects and the possibility of adverse changes in other parameters, and to use the results of the Los Alamos Integrated Chemical Effects Tests (ICET) and sump screen vendor tests to reconcile the reserved margin with the sump screen design.

A discussion of the margin reserved for chemical effects, and a schedule for confirmatory testing will be provided in the September 1, 2005 response.